PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8
Integrated Regional Water Management Grant Program
Implementation Step 2 Proposals

PIN: 10029
Applicant Name: Contra Costa Water District
Project Title: East Contra Costa County Integrated Regional Water Management

Funds Requested: $25,000,000
Total Project Cost: $197,096,853

Total Proposal Score: 98

Description: This proposal includes 8 projects, each addressing one or more of the regional objectives. Projects include the Antioch Recycled Water Implementation, DWD Well Utilization, Pittsburgh Recycled Water Project, the Alternative Intake Project, Antioch WTP Solids Handling Project, CCWD Canal Improvement Project, Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration, and HCP Habitat and Watershed Restoration Project.

Question: Adopted IRWMP and Proof of Formal Adoption ***5***

The applicant has submitted a FED, which has been adopted by all of the participating entities

Question: Description of Region ***4***

The FED consists of 5 regional water management plans and studies which form the basis of the "umbrella document." The FED has a detailed discussion of the region and includes current and future water resources; appropriateness of the area for regional planning; quality and quantity of the water resources; 50-year water supply and demand analysis; important ecological process and environmental resources; social and cultural makeup of the community; and important trends within the region. The mapping provided is detailed and includes the necessary information to delineate the internal boundaries to the region, major water related infrastructure, major land-use divisions, hydrological characteristics, and economic distributions. However, there is limited discussion of the social makeup and cultural values and economic conditions.

Question: Objectives ***5***

The objectives in the FED are adequately addressed. Major water related objectives and conflicts in the region are also well articulated. The FED identifies the regional planning objectives and the manner in which they were determined

Question: Water Management Strategies and Integration ***5***

The application thoroughly describes each water management strategy that meets the objectives of the FED. A discussion of how the strategies will work together to achieve objectives is provided. There is also a discussion of the added benefits of integrating multiple water management strategies. The FED identifies specific projects that will utilize the strategies to meet the objectives

Question: Priorities and Schedule ***3***

There is only a limited discussion of decision-making will respond to regional changes. The methodology for reassessment and prioritization during implementation is not identified. The FED does not describe the structural framework or roles and responsibilities that will be established to ensure that decisions are based on the latest changes and assessments. The FED provides limited detail on how the assessment and reevaluation process will occur; how agency information of project success or failure will be transferred and used in evaluating regional success; and result in the project sequence adjustment indicated.

Question: Implementation ***4***

The FED has well defined actions, projects, and studies by which the FED will be implemented. A general timeline was provided for short-term projects, but was missing for long-term projects. However, some of the projects have tentative schedules. The entities responsible for project implementation are identified, as is the interdependence between projects. The current status of each project is listed. However, the mechanisms and institutional structure that will monitor the FED implementation progress need to be more clearly identified

Question: Impacts and Regional Benefits ***5***

The benefits from implementation as well as the impacts from not implementing the plan are addressed. The anticipated impacts and potential benefits are listed for all 31 projects included in the FED. DAC issues are addressed. It is stated that some projects would not be possible on their own. However, combined the projects become feasible and have higher benefits. Also, some issues and potential conflicts will be reduced or avoided through this regional effort. The advantages of the FED are stated as increased regional understanding, economies of scale, and fostering support within the region. Interregional impacts and benefits are also briefly addressed. Negative impacts of not implementing the FED are supported by its relationship to the Delta and other proposed IRWMPs.

Question: Technical Analysis and Plan Performance ***4***

The data types (water supply, population, water demand, land use, etc.), technical methods and analysis (hydraulic models, water quality models, species habitat maps and models, etc.) that were used to develop the FED are listed. The data gaps and need for further studies are identified. Project specific metrics will be used to evaluate project performance and project specific monitoring systems will be used to gather performance data. However, the applicant provides a limited discussion on how the lead agency and regional management agency will be the mechanism to adapt project operation and plan implementation.

Question: Data Management ***4***

Data dissemination to stakeholders and public will occur via websites, written materials, and workshops. As the FED continues to evolve, data management structures will be developed. However, individual agencies are tasked with management of data needs and the FED does not identify specific roles nor has a mechanism for data management. A more specific discussion of how data will be disseminated to stakeholders and the public is needed. Discussion on how data will be integrated into SWAMP /GAMMA is limited. Existing monitoring efforts for water supply and water quality for surface water and groundwater are examples provided.

Question: Financing ***4***

Beneficiaries and potential funding and financing for the projects are identified. It is uncertain, based on the discussion in the FED, who will make up the difference if State and federal funding are not secured for both implementation and O&M costs. O&M costs are not eligible costs for State grant funding. The FED alludes to the concept of "beneficiaries pay" principle as a possible funding mechanism at the local level. Many of the projects identify State agencies as potential source of funding.

Question: Relation to Local Planning & Sustainability ***5***

This FED will be a unifying document for previous local and regional planning efforts. Six plans are listed as examples. The mechanics of the evolution is fully documented in the application. Coordination with local land-use decision-makers is cited and demonstrated. The water management strategies, projects, and programs originated from local planning studies and plans. The water supply and demand data, objectives, and priorities are developed based on regional planning programs. Methodology for determining prioritization of projects is detailed.

Question: Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination ***4***

The FED is intended as an umbrella document and there is no stakeholder process for the overall IRWMP. The applicant is relying on the stakeholder processes from each of the individual plans which are generally adequate. The discussion given on how stakeholders will participate in implementation efforts or how they may influence water management decisions is limited. The precise mechanism that allows stakeholders to influence water management decisions has not been determined. A table describes mechanisms that will be used to facilitate stakeholder involvement and communication during implementation for each of the projects.

Weighted IRWMP Total Score: 26

Question: Work Plan ***9***

The work plan section contains: 1) a good introduction with goals and objectives, 2) show which project meets the objectives and watershed management elements, 3) provides an overview of the projects and status, and 4) maps of project locations. Synergies and linkage of the projects are cited as an important factor. However, a limited discussion of the synergies and linkages between projects is provided. Most projects are sufficiently detailed to determine that the projects can be implemented. PAEPs and reporting schedules are shown. Permit and environmental compliance requirements, including CEQA, are provided. However, the HCP and Antioch Water Treatment Project work plans provide limited discussion and details. Supporting CEQA documentation is missing, resulting in a limited degree of certainty that those projects can be implemented.

Question: Budget ***3***

The individual project summary budgets are not consistent with explanations and detailed budgets. In general, supporting documentation or methods of estimation is not discussed. The HCP Project budget is not detailed. Of the 3 projects with completed work, only 1 project had actual documented costs. Three of the 8 projects have substantial design and construction contingencies with limited explanation provided. Supporting documentation for project costs often does not agree with the summary costs identified for the projects or the explanation. It is unclear what will happen to Projects 4 and 7, which rely on CALFED or the Coastal Conservancy funding, if funding is not actually secured.

Question: Funding Match ***5***

The funding match is 68% of the total proposal costs.

Question: Schedule ***3***

Most of the projects begin implementation before December 1, 2007, with some beginning construction before June 1, 2008. However, schedules are not consistent or reasonable in some cases. None of the projects included a final report and most do not include a monitoring plan or QAPP. A few projects need more detail or milestones in their schedule. Two of the 8 projects are scheduled to be in the construction stage prior to the scheduled grant agreement execution date. For 7 of the 8 projects, no details, other than indication that a PAEP will be developed, were provided that identify how the projects will be monitored and evaluated after implementation. Scheduling for acquisition of required permits and completion of environmental certification may be unrealistic. One of the projects show CEQA/NEPA as having been fulfilled, without supporting documentation.

Question: Scientific and Technical Merit ***12***

Supporting scientific studies and data are provided for most projects in the proposal. However, the studies are either structured to support the project instead of objectively analyzing the problem or are incomplete. For example, alternative treatments were not considered for the Antioch Plant expansion such as improvements to the lagoons that will reduce water contamination, mimic natural processes in waste reduction, and be more cost effective.

Question: Monitoring, Assessment and Performance Measures ***4***

The PAEP does not appear to provide tangible performance measures of project success and the determination of the feasibility of the projects to meet targets within the life of the proposal. Many of the outcome indicators should have been output indicators and are not directly linked to goals. Outputs are actions, rather than a measurement, and target an indirect measurement of the goals.

Question: Economic Analysis ***9***

The PV of costs is $189 million and the quantified benefits are $566 million. Most of the benefits are the avoided costs of a desalination plant. Some text and tables disagree regarding when that plant would be built. Emergency storage benefits in Los Vaqueros may not be claimed correctly for the period after the plant is built. Less than 5,000 AF of yield was quantified. For the Pittsburg Project, $1,160 is a "water system treated water rate" which is not the same as the marginal cost of producing potable water. Recycled water is not strictly comparable to potable. The value of water quality improvements from the Canal Improvement Project may be small. The desired water quality standard of 65 mg/l chloride is currently met 85% of the time.

Question: Other Expected Benefits ***6***

The Other Expected Benefits appear to be an average level. Cost savings for reduced fertilizer application using recycled water is not thoroughly supported; the applicant does not identify cost associated with remedial actions required to offset additional salt concentration. Water supply benefits during a drought achieved by the use of recycled water may have unintended negative consequences as the aesthetic value (benefit) of having lush landscaping may encourage the public to use non-recycled water instead of conservation. The recreation benefits of having greener grass are not supported. Habitat benefits cannot be realized without permanent commitment to reduce water intake from the Delta. Protection of fisheries may be accomplished by retrofitting existing intake at lower cost. Use of solid handling method of removing waste solid, may not eliminate all chemical contaminates, as asserted.

Question: Program Preferences ***3***

The proposal includes projects that implement multiple Program Preferences. However, there is limited degree of certainty that the Program Preferences claimed can be achieved and the application lacks thorough documentation for the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preferences to be implemented. The FED categorizes local, regional, and State for magnitude of the benefits but does not describe how benefits can be achieved in sufficient detail.

Question: Statewide Priorities ***18***

The applicant less than fully addresses Statewide Priorities and demonstrates a limited degree of certainty which Statewide Priorities can be achieved. The applicant failed to provide sufficient detail to support how the priorities can be met. The TMDL priority should have listed the TMDL standards that needed to be met, the pollutant that was being reduced, and estimate the amount of reduction that would occur. The description for meeting the Delta Water Quality objective for drinking water did not describe the pollutants being reduced or how the projects will reduce reliance on the Delta water supply. The applicant claims education and outreach and urban runoff as priorities meeting the NPS Plan, but those efforts were not discussed in detail.

Total Proposal Score:	**98**